

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-8 are pending. Claims 1-8 are rejected. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, and 8 are amended.

Applicants submit the following remarks and respectfully request reconsideration of the application.

### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,629,152 (Kingsbury).

Amended claim 1 recites a means for comparing a resulting value of the first uninterruptible operation stored in the affected reservation location to an upper value and a lower value to determine if the resulting value is within a range defined by the upper value and the lower value that can be changed. Amended claim 1 also recites a means for performing a second uninterruptible operation to restore the affected reservation location if the resulting value of the first uninterruptible operation is not within the range defined by the upper value and the lower value.

Kingsbury teaches message passing between processes using a mailbox data structure (Abstract). In paragraph 8 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner states that “the step of checking whether the mailbox data structure is full in Kingsbury reads on the applicant’s step of comparing the resulting value with the limit values.” The Examiner also states that “[d]etermining whether the mailbox data structure is full requires checking the n\_reserved variable to determine if it is less than the size of the message

slots array [slot N, FIG. 5] and greater than zero [slot 0, FIG. 5] since the size of the data structure can't be represented as a negative value.”

As explained above, amended claim 1 recites comparing a resulting value to an upper value and a lower value to determine if the resulting value is within a range defined by the upper value and the lower value. Applicants fail to see how Kingsbury teaches or suggests determining if the resulting value is within a range defined by the upper value and the lower value. Instead, Kingsbury only checks an upper limit to see if the mailbox is full (col. 10, lines 27-33). Thus, Kingsbury teaches checking if the n\_reserved value has met a maximum upper limit to ensure there remains space to accept another message. This is as opposed to checking whether the resulting value is within a range defined by the upper value and the lower value as recited in amended claim 1. Therefore, absent a teaching or suggestion of a comparison of a value with a range, Kingsbury does not teach or suggest comparing the n\_reserved value to an upper value and a lower value to determine if the resulting value is within a range defined by the upper value and lower value as recited in amended claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicants fail to see how Kingsbury teaches comparison of a value with a lower limit. The Office Action recites that Kingsbury checks to determine if the n\_reserved variable is greater than zero. Applicants respectfully disagree in that all Kingsbury is concerned with is whether an upper limit has been reached, not whether a value falls within a defined range. Further, since the size of the mailbox data structure in Kingsbury cannot be represented as a negative value, as the Office Action states, there would be no purpose in Kingsbury to check whether the n\_reserved value is within a range of zero and the mailbox size limit. Again, all Kingsbury does is check whether an

upper limit has been reached. Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the limitation of comparing a resulting value with an upper value and a lower value to further distinguish that the comparison of the resulting value with a lower value is not taught or suggested in Kingsbury.

In regards to the MBOX\_FULL\_NO\_SLOTS\_ERROR message, the old\_n\_reserved value in Table 1 in col. 9 of Kingsbury does not teach or suggest a comparison with a range defined by an upper limit and a lower limit. Similarly, as argued above, the old\_n\_reserved value is only compared with a upper limit to check whether the mailbox is full as opposed to a comparison of a resulting value with an upper value and a lower value to determine if the resulting value is within a range defined by the upper value and the lower value as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner also states that dynamically changing of limit locations is not supported in the specification and that the limit values as dynamically adjustable is not in the claims. Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite that the upper value and the lower value can be changed. Clearly, in the last paragraph of page 10, the clean specification supports the use of limit registers 2540 and 2550 for the upper value and lower value. Additionally, the use of registers clearly communicates values stored therein can be changed. For example, when a processor processes instructions, the registers store values that may be constantly changing based on the instruction processing. Therefore, claim 1 is allowable over Kingsbury for at least the above reasons.

Claim 2 is dependent on claim 1 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 3-8 are also allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

### Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, the pending claims in this application are in condition for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to allow the pending claims in this application. The Examiner is invited to call Applicants' representative at the number below if he has any questions or if there are remaining outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Herbert W. Sullivan et al.

Date: 11/29/04

By: Eugene Kim

Eugene Kim, Reg. No. 46,267  
Carr & Ferrell LLP  
2200 Geng Road  
Palo Alto, CA 94303  
Phone: (650) 812-3400  
Fax: (650) 812-3444